

**Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
2006 Quadrennial Regulatory Review –	)	MB Docket No. 06-121
Review of the Commission’s Broadcast	)	
Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted	)	
Pursuant to Section 202 of the	)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	
	)	MB Docket No. 02-277
2002 Biennial Regulatory Review – Review	)	
of the Commission’s Broadcast Ownership	)	
Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant	)	
to Section 202 of the Telecommunications	)	
Act of 1996	)	MM Docket No. 01-235
	)	
Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and	)	
Newspapers	)	MM Docket No. 01-317
	)	
Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple	)	
Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in	)	
Local Markets	)	MM Docket No. 00-244

Definition of Radio Markets

To the Commission:

**Additional Formal Comments of Nickolaus E. Leggett**

The following are additional formal comments from Nickolaus E. Leggett on aspects of the issue of ownership of American broadcast media. I am one of the original petitioners for the establishment of the Low Power FM (LPFM) radio broadcasting service (RM-9208 July 7, 1997 subsequently included in MM Docket 99-25). These comments are in addition to my comments filed on August 8, 2006.

**International Short Wave Radio Broadcasting and Media Diversity**

A traditional source for additional diversity in broadcast media has

been international short wave broadcasting (SWBC). High power foreign broadcast stations operate in several ITU-allocated frequency bands within the range of 5.9 MHz to 26.1 MHz. Most of these stations transmit double-sideband amplitude modulation (AM) signals.

One can use a very simple radio receiver to receive these international transmissions. In my case, I have a crank-powered short wave receiver that cost \$39.95 from a local electronics vendor. Many people have built their own short wave receivers. Simple receivers work well because the SWBC stations run very high power output signals (50 to 100 KW and up).

Foreign SWBC stations offer program content and political views that are often different than the offerings of domestic American broadcasters.

### **Loss of the Short Wave Broadcast Option**

The option of listening to short wave broadcasts will decline in the future due to the expected spread of Broadband over Power Lines (BPL). BPL is an Internet service that uses electric power lines. The BPL technologies in use radiate radio frequency noise in the frequency bands used by short wave broadcasting. This noise will block any SWBC reception for Americans living near power lines used by BPL.

In addition, short-wave listeners do not have the organized political clout to force the BPL providers to avoid emitting noise on the short wave broadcast frequency bands.

The Commission should consider the impact of the loss of this option

on the diversity of programming available to Americans.

### **Internet Alternatives to Short Wave Broadcasting**

Those Americans with access to broadband Internet service have the option of listening to foreign broadcasts sent via the Internet. This Internet alternative will attract many affluent listeners, and viewers, away from conventional broadcast media in general.

However, this Internet option for diversity will not be generally available to lower-income Americans who will be left with whatever broadcast diversity exists under the new media ownership rules.

### **Mobile Listeners and Media Ownership**

At the present time, mobile listeners are restricted to the offerings provided by local terrestrial broadcasters and by satellite broadcasters. Much of the radio listening in the United States is drive-time listening by commuters in their cars. If only one or two broadcast corporations dominate radio in a given city this will have a negative impact on that city with only one point of view presented to the public.

In the longer run, mobile Internet service will be available for more affluent Americans. This will encourage the general trend of the affluent away from conventional broadcast media. Presumably the mobile Internet services will provide a wide diversity of domestic and foreign audio programming. Again we see a class bias where diversity is available for the more affluent, and the poor are stuck with whatever diversity survives the

new media ownership rules.

### **Do We Want to Keep Conventional Broadcasting?**

If the conventional radio and TV broadcast media become highly consolidated, with only a few corporate views broadcast, do we want to keep conventional broadcasting at all? Or should their channels be reassigned to other services including wireless Internet services?

The best argument for retaining conventional broadcasting is its service to Americans of all economic strata and its potential for emergency information broadcasting. However, the ownership rules should be structured so that multiple media organizations have access to each city and local broadcast organizations (and individuals) have the opportunity to broadcast.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Nickolaus E. Leggett, LPFM Petitioner (RM-9208)**

**1432 Northgate Square, Apt. 2A**

**Reston, VA 20190-3748**

**(703) 709-0752**

**August 14, 2006**